

$$\begin{array}{c}) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \end{array}$$

By: James P. Jones
Chief United States District Judge

Case 1:05-cv-00034-JPJ-PMS Document 26 Filed 11/04/05 Page 1 of 2 Pageid#: 255

constitutional rights in the course of the prosecution. The defendants have moved to dismiss on the grounds of immunity and the statute of limitations, among other things. The plaintiff has responded to the motion and it is ripe for decision.

For the reasons stated by the defendants in their briefs, I find that the Defendants' Joint Motion to Dismiss should be granted.

By orders entered November 24, 2004, Arora was enjoined from filing any further suits or actions in this court pro se without the prior written permission of the court. *Arora v. Inderneel*, No. 1:04CV00030; *Arora v. Hyder*, No. 1:04CV00031; *Arora v. Matin*, No. 1:04CV00032; *Arora v. Fasih*, No. 1:04CV00033; *Arora v. Husain*, No. 1:04CV00034; *Arora v. Alemparte*, No. 1:04CV00035; *Arora v. Tabassum*, No. 1:04CV00036. The record of the present case does not indicate that Arora obtained any such permission. The plaintiff is advised that violation of this injunction may result in his prosecution for criminal contempt of the court's orders.

A separate order of dismissal will be entered herewith.

DATED: November 4, 2005

/s/ JAMES P. JONES
Chief United States District Judge